

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 4, 2007, and previous correspondence between Applicant and the Examiner. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner's attention that the *Crepy* and *Baker* references cited in the Office Action dated January 4, 2007 were not listed on the Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) attached to the Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these references be made of record in the following action.

Claims 1, 5-8 and 12-18 are pending, with Claims 1, 8, and 15-18 being independent. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 8, and 15-18 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 8 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,560,575 (*Keiller*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,536 (*Jochumson*), U.S. Patent No. 6,226,615 (*Kirby et al.*) and U.S. Patent No. 6,061,654 (*Brown et al.*).

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Keiller* in view of *Jochumson*, *Kirby et al.* and *Brown et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,121 (*Crepy*).

Claims 6, 7, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Keiller* in view of *Jochumson*, *Kirby et al.* and *Brown et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,613 (*Baker*).

As amended, independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, determination means for comparing a pattern of a recognized character string with a pattern of a recording character string, so as to obtain a matching rate between the pattern of the recognized character string and the pattern of the recording character string based on the comparison.

Each of independent Claims 8 and 15-18 recites, *inter alia*, the same or similar features. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited art would teach or suggest at least these feature.

The Examiner has acknowledged that *Keiller* involves comparing two user's utterances, but does not suggest a comparison or matching rate between a user's utterance and a recording character string. See Response to Arguments, Office Action dated July 25, 2006.

In particular, *Keiller* discusses that "word models" are used for comparison. These "word models" are generated from a sequence of feature vectors that are output by a feature extraction routine, which extracts nine cepstral coefficients and one energy coefficient for each frame of input speech. *Keiller*, column 14, lines 14-29. In other words, *Keiller* teaches a 10-dimensional acoustic feature parameter. The method disclosed by *Keiller* is, therefore, not disclosed as being capable of generating a character string.

In contrast, claim 1 recites (1) storing a *recording character string* indicating a sentence to be recorded; (2) recognizing input speech of the displayed sentence that a user reads out, and obtaining a *recognized character string*; (3) comparing a pattern of the *recognized character string* with a pattern of the *recording character string*, so as to obtain a matching rate between the pattern of the *recognized character string* and the pattern of the *recording character string* based on the comparison. As such, *Keiller* cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the features presently recited in each of the independent claims.

The Examiner will appreciate that the presently amended claim language further exemplifies the distinction, with regard to the comparison of two character strings, between the present invention, as recited in the claims, and the cited art.

The other cited art of record, namely, *Jochumson*, *Kirby et al.*, *Brown et al.*, *Crepy*, and *Baker* are not understood to remedy above-noted deficiencies with respect to independent Claims 1, 8 and 15-18.

The other claims in this application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ann M. McCamey/

Ann M. McCamey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 57,016

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

AMM/kim

DC_MAIN 274193v1